

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000



JAC: 241-1

March 4, 2004

TO: NASA HQ Office of Procurement (Code HS) (fax: 202-358-4065)

FROM: Jeff Brown, Contracting Officer RFP2-38210

SUBJECT: Administrator's Notice Of Significant Contract Actions (ANOSCA)

Title: Logistics Management Services, RFP2-38210 (JSB)

Description: This acquisition is for logistics management services which includes support for the following functions: (1) supply and warehouse management; (2) equipment management; (3) mail services; (4) packing, shipping and receiving services; (5) fleet management; (6) refuse services; (7) janitorial and recycling services and (8) industrial property management.

Identification of contract action and type: This procurement is for a new contract that combines elements¹ from two (2) existing Small Business Administration (SBA) Section 8(a) contracts into a single, hybrid SBA Section 8(a) Performance Based Contract (PBC) that includes elements of firm-fixed price, cost reimbursement, and indefinite quantity work. The contract will have a period of performance of one (1) year (base period) and four (4) one (1) year options for performance.

Total contract value: The proposed and the Government most probable costs are the same: \$38,449,362.

Name, address, and business size:

Prime:

Tessada and Associates, Inc.
8001 Forbes Place, Suite 310
Springfield, VA 22151
SBA 8(a) service related disabled veteran-owned company

¹ Janitorial and Refuse services were previously associated with the Grounds keeping and Pest control (JRGP) contract. Prior to the start of this SEC it was determined that janitorial and refuse services would be more appropriately associated with the logistic services and therefore those requirements were included in this RFP.

Sub:

Scientific and Commercial Systems Corporation, Inc. (SCSC)
7600 Leesburg Pike
East Bldg, Suite 400
Falls Church, VA 22043
SB, minority owned S corporation.

SB and SDB subcontracting goals:

SB and SDB subcontracting goals are not applicable to this competitive 8(a) procurement.

Principal work performance locations:

The intention of this Performance Based Contract (PBC) is to obtain Logistics Management services for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Ames Research Center (ARC) and Moffett Field (MF), Camp Parks locations. ARC and MF includes on-site and off-site Government, contract tenant organizations and Annexes 1- Military housing inside Moffett, 2- Military housing located outside Main Gate, west of Moffett Blvd. Extension, and 3- Military housing located on Moffett Blvd, west of US 101.

Brief description of unusual circumstances: None

Contact information:

Contracting Officer
Jeffrey S. Brown
(650) 604-4696

Project Manager
Kelly J. James
(650) 604-5140

Attachment 1

Separate attachment of unsuccessful Offerors:

A&O Enterprises, Inc.
5783 N. Sheridan Blvd., Suite 306
Arvada, CO 80002

Chugach McKinley, Inc.
560 E. 34th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99503-4161

Dellew Corporation
P.O. Box 17518
Honolulu, HI 96817

J.K. Hill & Associates, Inc.
2680 Production Road, Suite 101
Virginia Beach, VA 23454

TecuLAN
6305 Ivy Lane, Suite 704
Greenbelt, MD 20770

One proposal was not received in response to the RFP by the specified closing time and date from the following Offeror:

Bains Facilities Management, Inc. (BFM)
2470 Pulgas Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

Brief explanation of the general basis for selection:

My selection is based on a comparative assessment of the proposals against all source selection criteria in the RFP and represents my independent judgment. I noted, of course, that the RFP set differing values of importance for the three Evaluation Factors: Mission Suitability and Past Performance are equally weighted. Mission Suitability and Past Performance are each significantly more important than Cost/Price. I began my integrated assessment by examining the proposals' strengths and weaknesses. When I began my assessment, I noted that the raw number of strengths and weaknesses assigned to an offeror in a subfactor and that the offeror's numerical score did not always equate to the same scoring. All significant or other strengths or weaknesses do not carry equal weight. Each subfactor numerical score was based on the content of the strengths, weaknesses, and the overall merit of the proposal in that subfactor, not on a mechanical count of those respective strengths and weaknesses.

I closely considered the relative importance and impacts of the mission functions described in the Statement of Work, to ARC, and to its customers and stakeholders. Anything less than a highly competent management team and a stable and talented workforce can have a huge impact on ARC's mission and cause considerable cost inefficiency throughout the Center. The RFP reflects this same concern by ranking Mission Suitability as the most important along with Past Performance.

I have summarized some of the findings below that were critical to my decision:

Attachment 1

I began my integrated assessment by examining the SEC's detailed findings. I concluded that in all evaluations, the numerical scores accurately reflected the content of the strengths and weaknesses.

I first looked at the Offerors with the lowest Mission Suitability scores (J.K. Hill and Associates, Inc. and TecuLAN, Inc.) and compared them to Tessada and Associates. I determined that although these Offerors were competent, they should be eliminated from further consideration here because of the overall comparably lower quality of their Mission Suitability proposals.

Of the three remaining Offerors, I then examined the one with the next lowest Mission Suitability score (Dellew Corporation). Dellew was eliminated for two reasons. The first was that it had received the most SW of the remaining Offerors (neither of the other remaining offerors had any SW). The second is associated with its Cost/Price proposal being found to be neither fair nor reasonable. This resulted in the Offeror appropriately receiving a 'Low' confidence level, an assessment that I wholly share and consider to be a critical problem. For these reasons awarding to Dellew Corporation could not be accomplished without discussions, which goes against the Government's intent to award this contract without discussions.

At this point there were two (2) remaining Offerors (Chugach McKinley, Inc. and Tessada and Associates, Inc.). Both had acceptable Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Confidence level ratings. Tessada and Associates' proposal scored the highest in all four (4) Mission Suitability subfactors, had a higher overall rating (and significantly higher overall score) for Mission Suitability, had a higher Past Performance rating, and a lower overall proposed cost. In my judgment this makes Tessada and Associates the best value proposal for the Government.